Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION OF AMERICA, INC., et al., Plaintiffs,

v.

CENTER FOR MEDICAL PROGRESS, et

Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-00236-WHO (DMR)

ORDER ON JOINT DISCOVERY LETTER

Re: Dkt. No. 446

In response to Defendants' discovery request for a "PowerPoint concerning Novogenix presented to Plaintiff PPLA," Plaintiffs produced a nine-page printout of a PowerPoint presentation with seven of the nine slides fully redacted. The remaining, unredacted slides were the cover slide entitled, "Abortion Services at PPLA Board Presentation 2/14/12" and the eighth slide, entitled "Tissue Donation." The eighth slide appears to discuss a statement by Novogenix about its tissue donation program with PPLA. Plaintiffs redacted the other slides on the grounds that they contain "confidential internal information" that is irrelevant and sensitive. [Docket No. 446 at 2.] Defendants Center for Medical Progress, BioMax Procurement Services, LLC, and David Daleiden now move to compel Plaintiffs to produce a full, unredacted version of the PowerPoint presentation. See id. at 1-2.1

On January 30, 2019, the court ordered Plaintiffs to lodge an unredacted copy of the PowerPoint presentation for the court's in camera review. [Docket No. 450.] Having reviewed the document in camera, the court denies Defendants' motion to compel. Consistent with Plaintiffs' representations, the redacted portions of the document contain information about one affiliate's abortion practices, including "the identity of medical institutions that work with PPLA, the numbers of abortions provided broken down into several categories and results of various

¹ This matter is suitable for resolution without a hearing. Civ. L.R. 7-1(b).

United States District Court Northern District of California

patient studies." Jt. Letter 2. This information, which is sensitive and confidential, is not relevant to the claims and defenses at issue in this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 11, 2019

